DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 980 JC 740 353

AUTHOR	Ebersole, Jay F.
TITLE	The Student Development Program: A Process of Affective Learning in American Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	Nova Univ., Fort Lauderdale, Fla.
PUB DATE	20 Jul 7"
NOTE	22p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Affective Objectives; Higher Education; *Human Development; Literature Reviews; Post Secondary Education; Practicums; *Student Development; *Student Personnel Services; Technical Reports

ABSTRACT

This paper is a discussion of the emerging model of student development programming for the 1970's. After an historical sketch of Student Personnel Service, the affective domain of student development is detailed with regard to theory, instruction, counseling, and administration. (Author/DB)

ED 095980

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE STUDENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM:

A PROCESS OF AFFECTIVE LEARNING IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Jay F. Ebersole
Harrisburg Area Community College

Practicum Paper

Nova University

July 20, 1974

JC 740 353

CONTENTS

I. Introduction

II. Historical Development

III. Student Development Theory

IV. Human Development Program

V. Student Development Specialists

A. Teachers

B. Counselors

C. Administrators

VI. Postscript

VII. Notes

VIII. Bibliography

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper is a discussion of the emerging model of student development programming for the decade of the seventies. After an historical sketch of Student Personnel Services, the affective domain of student development will be detailed with regard to theory, instruction, counseling, and administration. The excitement and importance of the contemporary student development emphasis is caught in Grant's autobiographical reflection: "These moments of encounter, these brief, fleeting moments of discovering my own identity through the being of others help me realize that I probably can't define my being by doing but by being with others; and perhaps these others gain fleeting glances of their own identity, their own being, themselves during these moments."[1]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

II. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

Some authors hint with negative innuendo that the field of student affairs has never had clear identity (Parker, 1974). One does admit that at gatherings of student personnel educators much time and effort are spent on role definition, vocational ambiguity, and professional accountability. However, the changing profile of student services can be a testimony to the flexibility in response by higher education to the dynamics of student needs in contrast to a fixed and sterile pattern of institutional organization.[2] That is, the very fact that the form of professional service has adapted to changing functions in student needs is noteworthy and positive.

Over the past fifty years, three phases of development in student services have been identified (O'Banion, Thurston, Gulden, 1972; Hurst, Weigel, Morrill, Richardson, 1973; Parker and Morrill, 1974). Initially, the college president appointed a dean to control the students by regulation, repression, and removal. He monitored student behavior as "warden" of the institution. Happily, against the abuses of this office the students eventually drafted and demanded their "bill of rights." As student rights diminished the autocratic role and rule of the Dean of Students office, specialists in services needed by students were being gathered under the administration of the Dean of Students. As high as thirty-six service functions have been identified attracting a corps of appropriately trained service people and a mesh of bureaus to meet the maintenance needs of students. In the post-World War II era, the third stage of student personnel work concentrated on a therapeutic

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

service to those students who had serious problems. Counseling psychologists were closeted in clinical centers with opportunity to meet just a few students with severest troubles. Some institutions did not move through each of these stages; some institutions have maintained each phase in its portfolio of student services. But increasingly some have moved from these now traditional patterns of student services to a human development concept.

For the first half century, student personnel services had been developing as a series of services reacting to forces within the college community, forces calling for control, maintenance, remediation of students. In recent times, student personnel service has been developing as an active program for the shaping of forces within the total college experience to maximize the potential for the growth and development of students. As early as the 1940's, the American Council on Education called on student personnel workers to recognize that students are individually different and unique; that each is a whole self integrating emotional, affective, physical, social and intellectual resources; that education begins in the drives, interests, needs of each student.[3] Historically, education has been centered in the development of the student through the training of intellectual capabilities and skills that have been narrowly defined in the academic disciplines. But now student development is being defined by humanistically oriented educators and psychologists from the point of view that "man (sic) is a growing organism, capable of moving toward self-fulfillment and responsible social development, whose potential for both has been only partially realized." (O'Banion, Thurston, Gulden, p.203)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The contemporary student development program caps the move of student personnel services from the traditional control-oriented governing of student life by _in loco parentis_ staff to the team of human development facilitators who assist students with those developmental tasks prerequisite to constructive and successful interaction with their environment. A student development program no longer is controlled by a dean whose staff works within well-defined job descriptions, but rather consists of staff and students who can "shake themselves loose" and exercise personal responsibility and creativity in the innovations of developmental programs and procedures (Hurst, et al, p.11).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III. STUDENT DEVELOPMENT THEORY

Parker (1974) lists three current uses of the term student development. The first he describes as "new humanism," notably of O'Banion and Thurston (1972). Student development is the structuring of a caring environment productive of growth toward self-actualization. However, descriptions of student personnel workers and courses do not, for Parker, define the propositions of developmental theory which tell how students achieve the stated goals of growth and effective learning.

Parker then describes development as cognitive and behavioral complexity. By challenging a person's "equilibrium" new learning takes place to restore the lost balance. Such upending experiences contrast sharply with the humanistic self-growth potential described above. Critical to this complexity of restructuring is the risk that a person may not be assessed accurately as to the ability to stand up under upsetting development-promoting activity. Blocher (1974) defines growth as the function of a "dynamic equilibrium" between the needs and capacities of an individual and the levels of stress and stimulation in the environment. When the level of stress is above the ability to cope, one withdraws. When the level of stimulation is below, one is bored and unchallenged. In neither case, does positive growth occur. Blocher wants the educational system to create a dynamic equilibrium or "ecological balance" between the student and the environment to allow for maximum growth. A student development program of "ecological balance" would include "structures" of opportunity, where tasks to be learned are balanced with mastery, of support where cognitive coping mechanisms are balanced

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

with affective social relationships, and of reward when effort expended is balanced with satisfied needs (p.363f). Blocher's view of the complexity of equilibrium is a more hopeful student development theory than Parker's fear of risk in manipulating the equilibrium. Nonetheless, both sound too much like MBO, rather than embryo!

Smith (1974) contrasts these first two views of development as process-oriented humanism and goal-oriented behaviorism. The former he describes as a Rogerian client-centered activity of self-actualization. The latter he views as Skinnerian objectives stated in behavioral terms, as performance criteria, as accountability measures. Smith proposes a student development program of behavioral humanism in which goals are humanized and attainable and objectives are constructive and specific. He cites Maslow's "good person" and Landsman's "beautiful and noble person" as the ultimate developmental objective for individuals in contemporary society. Such students would be passionate with themselves, productive in relating to their external world, and compassionate toward others (p.516).

Parker's third psychological construct is his preference for development as stages or hierarchical. Piaget's stages of development recognize distinct and qualitative differences. Maslow's hierarchical theory outlines the sequence of developmental tasks to be mastered. In each, Parker applauds the necessity to specify the particular behaviors characteristic to the particular stage or station, and the specific task which must be mastered in order to make progress.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

To this writer, Parker's critical appreciation for "solid developmental theory" as applied to student development programming seems to be the necessary correction both to a naive humanism and a manipulative behaviorism, as long as at each stage along the student's way a good, beautiful and noble person is developing.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IV. HUMAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Blocher (1974) quotes a Berkeley longitudinal growth study (1955) which suggested that only a small percentage of people maintain intellectual growth or stability for a lifetime. The majority suffer "developmental arrest" as teen-agers, with a span of intellectual deterioration from that point on.[4] Palomares and Rubin (1973) state:

> "As children grow older, they begin to bury their feelings and thoughts, unconsciously distorting their expressions and actions. They start to feel that they are different, inferior, socially unacceptable. This feeling of negative uniqueness has been created in our society by a conspiracy of silence. Nobody talks about fantasies, dreams, wild thoughts, feelings of helplessness, loneliness, feelings of worthlessness. Children are educated away from validating their own feelings. When they are afraid, they are told that there is nothing to be afraid of. When they feel pain, they are told to be brave and smile. They conclude at an early age that what is going on inside of them is unique, suspect, and unsayable." (p.655)

The Human Development Program is an instructional model and technique for use in student development programming to cope with developmental arrest through the use of affective learning activities. It focuses on themes of "awareness" of one's feelings, thoughts, and actions; "mastery" and self-confidence; and "social interaction" with others (Palomares and Rubin, 1973). Kleeman (1974) who has researched the Human Development Instruction model at Colby College (Kansas) defines its goal as providing a structure within which students can generate and share extensive positive information about themselves. With structured activity of mutual and self-affirmation, students are introduced to a greater awareness of and respect for their own potential and that of others. General objectives are that students will be able to share in detail such personal possessions

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

as values, satisfying and successful experiences, personal strengths, and life goals. Specific objectives deal with positive changes in the ability of the student to affirm and motivate self, be self-determining, and to be empathetic toward others. The group process of Human Development Instruction includes goal setting, personal unfoldment, peak experience recall, sharing of successful and satisfying experiences, value clarification, strength acknowledgment, long-range goal commitment, and personalization of a positive style of life. O'Banion, Thurston, Gulden (1972) emphasize that Human Development or Human Potential Instruction in no way resembles a Psychology course of academic content with subject syllabus, nor is it the college orientation and adjustment course of the most recent generation. Rather it is an introspective examination of student experiences with the opportunity to examine values, attitudes, beliefs, abilities, and how these affect the quality of relationships with others.

Kleeman's research results recorded significant differences in movement toward self-actualization on the part of Human Potential Seminar students as contrasted with non-Human Potential Seminar students. Similarly, the research of White (1974), Hipple (1973), Walton (1973) using a variety of instruments for growth study, recorded positive significance among those who experienced Human Development Instruction and Human Potential Laboratory experiences.[5]

Creamer (1972) in a survey of 90 Community Colleges having Human Development Instruction tabulated replies from 49 respondents. Most of these institutions have one or two HDI courses with sections generally

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

numbering from one to fifty. Sections average eight to twelve students. Seven colleges give no credit for the course; 42 give institutional credit for all students; and 78% are able to transfer the credit to other institutions. All those replying found the course helpful in improving student self-concept. 53% used HDI for professional staff development. 47% found it strengthened student participation and input in faculty-student curriculum design. 80% replied that it increased student employability. 70% believed it was helpful in curtailing student drop-outs. 79% found it helped legitimize the teaching function of counselors; 90%, helped link student services with instructional programs; 70%, faculty recognized worth of HDI.[6]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

V. STUDENT DEVELOPMENT SPECIALISTS

A. Teachers

Crookston (1973) defines Human Development teaching on a broader base than only HDI courses staffed by student personnel specialists. It is the creation of a human learning environment within which individuals, teachers, and social systems interact and utilize developmental tasks for personal growth and social betterment. The teaching in every discipline is organized around the student, not the subject. The student shares at least equal responsibility with the teacher for the quality of learning with regard to content, process, and product. Evaluation is based on competency and goal achievement, not on prerequisites and requirements. Human Development teaching is a convergence of teaching, learning, and counseling in which students discover what is known and apply that knowledge to a deeper understanding of self, students discover ways of enhancing their relationships with others, and the students develop practices in coping effectively with their world. In such an instructional environment, student personnel professionals will not only teach credit courses in personal growth and development. Some will teach content courses peculiar to their expertise, not in competition against academic faculty, but teamed up with faculty colleagues sensitive to student development objectives and techniques (Cross, 1973).

Santa Fe Junior College demonstrates an interdisciplinary approach to Student Development program which places five courses at the core of the General Education program. Each student's experience of the changing environment of college is supported by the course, "The Individual in a

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Changing Environment." From this experience the student goes on to the examination of a series of other environments of which he is a part (Social Studies); the thing environment (Science); and the ideational environment (Humanities). Each of these is a course in the study of self in relation to expanding and complicated environments. The courses do not need nor serve as prerequisites. They are designed "to help the student to see himself in relationship to the world of knowledge and to afford him the opportunity to make good decisions both for the remainder of his collegiate experience and for other experiences that follow."[76]

B. Counselors

Crookston (1973), Larsen (1973), Hurst et al (1973) trace the movement of counselors from the historic role of passive, reflective, remedial professional service to an active, preventative, collaborative, encountering, even confronting relationship with students and increasingly with staff. Blocher (1974) uses the term developmental to describe counseling services as moving away from psychiatric diagnostic reference regarding normative behavior to the greater counselor interest in human effectiveness. Educational institutions were established, Blocher recalls, in order to help children and youth grow and develop in valued directions toward full adulthood and humanity. Larsen (1973) observes that Student Development center counselors encourage students toward self-direction and independence, teaching students to cope with life situations not by adjustment but by overcoming obstacles and frustrations. Counselors cannot isolate themselves with the few critical cases, waiting for students to be brought into their care, as in the medical model. Rather counselors need to venture forth

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

providing services for the development of the general student body, working with visible groups of students needing help in reaching positive goals. Larsen states it even stronger: "The returns to the students and the college will be much greater in working with a large number of students facilitating their normal development, than in trying to salvage a few with more serious problems." (p.225)

O'Banion's favorite phrase for counselors is "human development facilitators." Counselor activity involves a variety of areas: encounter group leadership; organization of community laboratory experiences; identification of participatory activities, not "sandbox" play; training of peer student educators as tutors and counselors; evaluation of institutional rules and regulations for relevancy to community college students; creation of the climate for growth and development (O'Banion, Thurston, Gulden, 1972). Palomares and Rubin (1973) emphasize the responsibility of student development counselors for teacher-training, providing supportive guidance to faculty using affective learning activities, helping teachers get in touch with their own personal dynamics, reinforcing teacher confidence to lead a group experience because they care about their students, developing inservice sessions for teachers in Human Development techniques to reduce the amount of energy spent by counselors in remediation. Berg (1972) warns counselors not to avoid responsibility for the development of instructors who seem unconcerned about the affective needs of students, or who feel such needs are not the business of a college, or who feel they meet these needs adequately in the classroom. The student development specialist looks also at the faculty member as a developing individual.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

C. Administrators

Hurst et al (1973) views the contemporary movement for change in student personnel services from a primary concern with "the remediation of casualties" to the developmental approach designed (a) to modify the academic and social environment in constructive ways; (b) to teach students living in the college environment the skills necessary for the full utilization of that environment; (c) to study the student and the environment to provide a data base and directionality for programs designed to implement (a) and (b). (p.10)

Restructuring for modification and change of the educational environment involves the administrator in serious responsibilities. There is the potential threat to the roles of persons involved. Staff needs to participate in conceptualization and decision-making. Other administrative and organizational structures become involved. The restructuring process must be kept alive by ongoing experimentation and flexibility. Goals and objectives need continuing reassessment. Harvey (1974) describes curriculum as a primary arena of activity for the student personnel administrator. As the advocate for student-centered curricula, the administrator must direct attention to effecting curriculum development in favor of the student. Student needs must be determined. Faculty and administration, this writer adds students, then interact to design curricula reflecting those needs. The student personnel administrator facilitates student development by establishing an effective and potent educational environment not only in classroom and curricula, but in the total institution and community, striving to bring all major constituencies into a concern

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

for the student. If this were to happen, Harvey observes, the student development administrator will have phased himself right out of a job. (p.246)

Parker and Morrill (1974), like Hurst et al, remind the student personnel administrator that failures are a valuable experience in student development programs, and one surmises are more frequently experienced than the successes, else more risks would be taken. Not only must the administrator be careful to specify objectives, identify needs, keep faith with the time and setting for which the program is applicable, but also provide for the self-destruct of the program when the need is satisfied or when the program is unable to fill the need, or when saboteurs set in.

For administrators who are facilitative of student development philosophy and programs, Cross (1973) admonishes:

> "It is too early to begin the training of applied behavioral scientists as practitioners in student development. We just don't know enough about it. Until we can measure the existence of personal maturity in an individual, we are in an untenable position to know how to bring such maturity about." (p.79)

Blocker and Odom (1972), O'Banion, Thurston, Gulden (1972) said it earlier: There is a "paucity" of research in student services, a decided lack of evaluation of the effectiveness of services. Hipple (1973), Walton (1973), White (1974), Kleeman (1974) are beginning to publish positive results of their research into Human Potential experiences. Administrators can be encouraged, with moderation.

Hill (1974) discusses student development attitudes in administrators. One cannot react defensively to change. One must establish a high degree

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of trust with colleagues, faculty and students. Self-confidence and role-satisfaction are helpful for open and honest communication. Open-mindedness copes better with unfamiliar tasks. Administrative power can be halved into group process to be shared with organizational control. Communication which flows up, down, and sideways builds in others a trust in the opportunity to communicate. To help others to grow, an administrator must be growing. Leadership is the ultimate responsibility developed in the administrator by the participation of all concerned.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

VI. POSTSCRIPT

Harvey (1974) with an eye to the future sees the current labor market, youth's disillusionment, material accumulation inflated and devalued, potential retirement at 38, leisure-time boredom, ineffective social services, and one could add moral expediency, immobilized government, national disillusionment, and international confusion—in the light of undergraduate preparation of students for professional and vocational roles in society, and comments:

> "All these factors combine to suggest that undergraduate education may need to get out of the business of professional or vocational preparation, and back into the business of human development." (p.243)

Cross (1973) describes our professional "luster" as the reflection of our solid knowledge of students and the procedures and experiences that will help them to grow and develop as learners and as human beings, through improved group learning experiences. (p.80)

Terry Cline, Director of Mountain States Community College Consortium, writing (1974) on the letterhead of Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, reflects a view of the student development program which others may share:

> "The Human or Student Development 'kick' is in vogue on many campuses but unfortunately this latest thrust in community college student personnel services programs is suffering the fate of most new philosophical ideas, e.g., poorly defined, uncertainty as to how student development programs fit into the student personnel and/or college organization, uncertainty as to how you determine or assess the effectiveness of student development programs, relationship to instructional programs, etc."[8]

Larsen (1973) quotes an appropriate verse of unknown origin (p.226):

> "We see things
> Not as they are
> But as we are."

This is what student development is all about.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

VII. NOTES

1. Grant, W. Harold, writing in the introduction to O'Banion and O'Connell, The Shared Journey, p.viii.

2. Shaffer, Robert H., in an unpublished paper, "Utilizing Organizational Development Methods, Obstacles and Potentialities." Indiana University, n.d.

3. American Council on Education, The Student Personnel Point of View. Washington, D.C.: 1949. Referred to by Parker and Morrill (1974).

4. Bayley, N. and M. Ogden, "The Maintenance of Intellectual Ability in Gifted Adults." Journal of Gerontology, 1955, 10, 91-107. Quoted by Blocher (1974).

5. Kleeman used Philosophies of Human Nature Scale (Wrightsman 1964). White used Personal Orientation Inventory (Shostrom 1966), also used by Walton who used in addition Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (Cattrell and Elson 1962). Hipple used Interpersonal Relationship Retiring Scale (Hipple 1970), The Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior (Schutz 1958) and The Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (Journal 1964).

6. Creamer, Don, Human Development Instructor for Career Students in the Community College: An Exploratory Study. Texas Education Agency and El Centro College, September 1972.

7. Fordyce, Joseph W., "General Education at Santa Fe College," an unpublished paper, August 1967.

8. Cline Letter circulated to members of Commission XI, "Student Personnel Programs in the Junior College" of American College Personnel Association, 1974.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

VIII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Berg, Ernest H., "Curriculum Development and Instruction: A Proposal for Reorganization," Student Development Programs in the Community Junior Colleges, eds. O'Banion and Thurston. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

2. Brown, Robert D., Student Development in Tomorrow's Higher Education: A Return to the Academy. ACPA Student Personnel Monograph Series, No. 16, March 1972.

3. Blocher, Donald H., "Toward an Ecology of Student Development," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, February 1974, 52(6), 360-365.

4. Blocker, Clyde E. and James A. Odom, "Influences from the Outside," Student Development Programs in the Community Junior Colleges, eds. O'Banion and Thurston. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

5. Crookston, Burns Ballantyne, "Education for Human Development," New Directions for College Counselors, eds. Warnath and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

6. Cross, Patricia K., "Student Personnel Work as a Profession," Journal of College Student Personnel, January 1973, 14(1), 77-81.

7. Harvey, Thomas R., "Some Future Directions for Student Personnel Administration," Journal of College Student Personnel, July 1974, (15(4), 243-247.

8. Hill, Johnny R., "Human Management Concepts for Student Development Administrators," Journal of College Student Personnel, May 1974, 15(3), 168-170.

9. Hipple, John L., "Personal Growth Outcomes Due to Human Relations Training Experiences," Journal of College Student Personnel, March 1973, 14(2), 156-163.

10. Hurst, James C., Richard G. Weigel, Weston H. Morrill, and Frank C. Richardson, "Reorganizing for Human Development in Higher Education: Obstacles to Change," Journal of College Student Personnel, January 1973, 14(1), 10-15.

11. Kleeman, Joseph L., "The Kendall College Human Potential Seminar Model: Research," Journal of College Student Personnel, March 1974, 15(2), 89-95.

12. Larsen, Charles E., "A Student Development Center," New Directions for College Counselors, eds. Warnath and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

VIII. BIBLIOGRAPHY
(Continued)

13. O'Banion, Terry and April O'Connell, The Shared Journey. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

14. O'Banion, Terry, Alice Thurston, and James Gulden, "Junior College Student Personnel Work: An Emerging Model," Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College, eds. O'Banion and Thurston. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

15. Palomares, Uvaldo H. and Terri Rubin, "Human Development in the Classroom" Personnel and Guidance Journal, May 1973, 51(9), 653-657.

16. Parker, Clyde A., "Student Development: What Does It Mean?" Journal of College Student Personnel, July 1974, 15(4), 248-256.

17. Parker, Clyde A. and Weston Morrill, "Student Development Alternatives," Journal of College Student Personnel, May 1974, 15(3), 163-167.

18. Smith, Darrell, "Integrating Humanism and Behaviorism: Toward Performance," Personnel and Guidance Journal, April 1974, 52(8), 513-519.

19. Tuma, Margaret, "Implementing a Program in Developmental Guidance and Counseling," Personnel and Guidance Journal, February 1974, 52(6) 376-381.

20. Walton, Don R., "Effects of Personal Growth Groups on Self-Actualization and Creative Personality," Journal of College Student Personnel, November 1973, 14(6), 490-494.

21. White, John, "The Human Potential Laboratory in the Community College," Journal of College Student Personnel, March 1974, 15(2), 96-100.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

OCT 18 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION